

REMARKS

Claims 31-42 and 51-54 are pending. Claims 1-30 and 43-50 are currently canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Interview Summary

Applicants appreciate the granting of the interview on September 22, 2010 between the Examiner and Applicants' undersigned counsel. During the interview, the undersigned pointed out that the cited prior art does not disclose an optical film having multiple layers and a peripheral edge, with the "multiple layers being fused together therebetween along a substantial portion of only the peripheral edge of said optical film" (Emphasis Added). Based on this distinction, the Examiner agreed to withdraw the Final Office Action and reopen prosecution.

§ 112 Rejections

Claim 42 is rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards (or Applicants regard) as the invention. In particular, the Office Action states that the term "intermingle" in claim 42 is vague and indefinite.

Regarding the term "intermingle", Applicants respectfully disagree with the position taken in the Office Action. The subject patent application clearly discloses what is meant by this term. In particular, for example, see Fig. 4, and page 16, lines 7-10. Therefore, claim 42 has not been amended.

In summary, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 42 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome, and that the rejection should be withdrawn.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 31-35, 37-42 and 51-54 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. (WO 01/096104) in view of Stefanik (U.S. 4,046,951). Claim 36 was also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. (WO 01/096104) in view of Stefanik (U.S. 4,046,951), as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Gourio (U.S. 6,334,382)

As discussed in the above noted interview, Stefanik does not disclose a method of fusing together the layers of a polymeric multilayer article. Stefanik discloses adhesively bonding an edge sealing system (e.g., the barrier layer 18 in Fig. 1) to the peripheral edge of a multilayer polymeric article. In particular, for example, see Column 3, lines 39-45 of Stefanik, which states:

The thin barrier layer, preferably 2 to 5 mils (0.05 to 0.13 millimeter) thick, is bonded to the edge of the interlayer 16 completely around the perimeter thereof. The barrier layer 18 preferably has its surface treated with a solution of an alkali metal addition component, preferably a sodium addition component, to improve its adhesion.
(Emphasis Added)

Stefanik does not disclose any process for applying his “edge seal system” to the peripheral edge of a multilayer polymeric article that causes the polymeric material of the layers to liquefy, melt or otherwise fuse together.

In contrast, the present application expressly teaches various ways of “fusing” the multiple layers together along their peripheral edges (see, e.g., page 3, lines 9-21). Therefore, the present claimed invention will not result by combining the teachings of the various cited references, because Stefanik does not teach causing any kind of “fusing” to take place between the layers of his multiple layer polymeric article. Claim 1 was previously amended, in response to the first Office Action, to make this distinction clear by reciting that the multiple layers of the optical film are fused together therebetween. As a result, it is submitted that the above § 103 rejections have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Examination and reconsideration of the application as amended is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

October 4, 2010

Date

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833

By: /Harold C. Knecht III/

Harold C. Knecht III, Reg. No.: 35,576
Telephone No.: 651-575-1056